

THE POLYNESIAN.

HONOLULU, JUNE 7, 1851.

INDEPENDENCE VS. PROTECTION.—In view of the communication of "An Old Resident," in our last number, and of several articles recently published by us, on the political relations of this kingdom, we offer the following remarks. Whatever may be the wishes of persons abroad, or however much they may express their desire to have these islands come under foreign rule or control, it remains true—as expressed by us, in our issue of May 11, 1850—that "the entire independence of the Hawaiian Kingdom, is the corner stone of our political principles; and education, religion, good morals, economy, order, peace, freedom from debt, an economical government, internal improvements, low taxes, &c., are the materials for the structure we would build." We shall deprecate the hour, should it ever unfortunately come, when His Majesty ceases to be the independent Sovereign of this kingdom, acknowledged and treated as such by foreign governments, and respected and beloved by loyal subjects.

We desire not to see one jot or tittle of his sovereignty or power pass into the hands of the American, English, or French nations, either as a protectorate, or in any other form. In the expression of this sentiment, we believe we but utter the wishes of nine-tenths of all foreigners who have interests at stake here; and we certainly do of the American and English governments, who have both, repeatedly, declared that they wish to assume no control or preponderating influence whatever, over the government of the islands. On this point there is little diversity of sentiment, we apprehend, to be found, amongst natives and foreign residents. We enjoy too much liberty, civil and religious—we are too much exempted from the grievous burden of taxation, under the present dynasty, to wish for a change, which could only be for the worse, in some of these respects. There is too strong a feeling of sympathy for the nation, and for the hereditary rulers, to wish to see them pass into oblivion in their own country, while it is acknowledged that their sway is mild, and, at the same time, secures as great a degree of safety to persons and property, as in any government under Heaven. And this should shield them from every attempt to subvert the Government, or to thrust embarrasments upon them. This should exempt them from foreign interference and intermeddling, where there is not a shadow of just cause, for acts either committed or contemplated.

In this view of the case, there is truth and point, too, in the declaration of the Minister of Foreign Relations, as expressed in his recent report to the Legislature, "That the King will either so govern, or he will abandon the reins of government, altogether." And in the following, published in our issue of May 17th, from the *Alta California*:—"If the sovereignty of the King, the perfect national supremacy of the Government, within its own borders, are not acknowledged, respected, and left untrammelled, can neither be honor nor pleasure in ruling. The result must be a determination, on the part of the King and Government, to form some alliance which shall insure respect and protection." What alternative remains, short of submission to foreign dictation? A dictation that would render the administration of the Government an utter impossibility, and result in a civil war.

On this subject Vattel says, "the greatest monarch ought to respect, in every Sovereign, the eminent character with which he is invested.—The independence, the equality of nations, the reciprocal duties of humanity, all invite to show the respect due to this quality of the conductor of even a small nation. The weakest state is composed of men, as well as the most powerful, and our duties are the same, towards all those who do not depend upon us."—Sec. 48, book 2, chap. 3.

"Every nation—every Sovereign—ought to maintain his dignity, by causing that respect to be paid to it, which is his due; and, especially, not to suffer that any stain be cast upon it."—Sec. 48.

In contending for his independence, His Majesty is contending for all that is worth possessing, as a sovereign. Had he violated existing treaties, and refused to make all suitable reparation, there might be some ground for persisting in demands that would secure that end. But, happily, no charge of violating treaties lies against His Majesty's Government. Monsieur Perrin, the Commissioner of the Republic of France, has distinctly exculpated His Majesty from such an imputation. The 8th Rule of Conference, published March 29, expressly declares, "To do homage to truth, and record a historical fact; the two Negotiators have solemnly recognized that—in the eyes of the two contending parties—the treaty of the 26th of March, 1846, has been, hitherto, maintained in its integrity."

If, in the face of this explicit declaration, by the very persons who negotiated the Treaty, demands are made, and persisted in of a character to utterly destroy the independence of His Majesty, as guaranteed by the Law of Nations, he should be driven to the last resort of an independent Sovereign—upon whom would rest the responsibility? "When a nation is not capable of preserving itself from insult and oppression, it may procure the protection of a more powerful state."—Vattel, etc. 192, chap. 16, book 1.

If it may "procure the protection of a more powerful state," "a more powerful state" may afford protection; and what friendly nation, we ask, would oppose this last resort of the weak and defenceless? Would Great Britain? We do not believe it. Would the United States? We are equally incredulous.

Neither of these Governments desire to exert a preponderating influence here, as they have repeatedly asserted; but can either of them stand calmly by, and see another government, possessing not a tittle of their interest in the country, put the shackles upon His Majesty, and not respond to the call for protection? Nay, would either of them array their power against the defenceless King in such an emergency?

Our correspondent asks—"Is America prepared to combat with the two first powers of the world?" Why this necessity, unless His Majesty is deprived of the last resort of the weak and defenceless? If England declined the call for protection, as our correspondent feels justified in asserting, would the lower that "high-minded" standard by joining those who

would, without cause, "deprive the good but defenceless King of his sovereignty? What alternative would then remain to his Majesty? Will "An Old Resident" reply?

There are several minor points in the communication of our correspondent, which may merit a brief notice. He says—"Neither is it a fact that the Americans form a very large majority of the foreign community; this assertion would have stood good some twelve or fourteen months back, but, since then, a very material diminution of that majority has taken place, and is still going forward, from the influx of British subjects; and, at the present moment, there is but a very slight difference, if any, between the American and English population."

It is quite true that a considerable number of British subjects have been added to the population of the islands, principally from the Australian Colonies, during the period stated; but, as no census has been taken, it is a mere matter of conjecture, that the difference has been equalized between the American and English population. A large number of Americans have, also, come in, from California, and direct from the United States, and scarce a ship arrives that does not bring an accession to this class of our population.

But however this may be, we most heartily deprecate the attempt, either here or elsewhere, to create ill-will and jealousy between Americans and Englishmen, resident upon the islands, from one common stock, speaking the same language, and having a common religion, we apprehend that the mutual relations of each, and their joint relations to the Government of the country, will be promoted by an entire absence of all national distinctions, party cliques, or jealous divisions. Let a spirit of charity prevail amongst them, and not one of envy; for it cannot escape the observation of the most superficial, that, with the fast diminishing native population, they are the progenitors of a race that must, one day, fill the places left vacant by the dying natives, and become the "people" of the land. Let them emulate each other in kindly acts to the native race, and in moulding society upon a permanent basis for the future.

An article from the *Alta California*, of more recent date than the one commented upon by "An Old Resident," takes a more correct view of the true policy of the great nations which have acknowledged the independence of this; in their conduct towards it. This was published in the *Polynesian* of May 10th, but we re-produce the following extract from it, on account of its justice, and as expressive of our own views:

"The location and condition of these islands—their ability to furnish supplies, of various kinds, to the shipping of the Pacific—their convenience for refitting and repairing—their transition state, from barbarism to civilization, and many other reasons, make it very important that they should remain untrammelled, independent, possessing and exercising the right of making and enforcing their own laws. They should be left to the exercise of a free discretion, in their own police regulations; free from any undue preponderance of any government—a kind of mutual rendezvous ground, where the ships and people of all nations may rest upon an honorable equality, and enjoy similar privileges and facilities, in the way of their business. For though by position, being nearer to us than any other people, and almost on the line between California and China, and, consequently, holding more immediate and intimate relations with us, yet there is no disposition, on the part of our citizens, to see the trade or the influence of the islands made a monopoly of, by any one nation, although it might be our own."

This is the correct doctrine of the King's independence from foreign interference; and, so far as we are aware, is the real sentiment of all Americans; while it disproves the assertion of "An Old Resident," that "the Americans have an itching to possess themselves of these islands." Should this policy be pursued, in the proper spirit of the Law of Nations, we have no apprehensions that we shall be troubled with "annexation" or "protectorates."

In regard to the procuring cause of all this trouble and discussion, pro. and con. we are often asked—"What is the present state of the French difficulty?" We answer—Since Sept., 1849, when Mr. Judd left, and up to the time of Monsieur Perrin's arrival, no progress whatever had been made in settling the difficulties, either in France, by the King's Ambassador Extraordinary, or here.

December 21, 1850, M. Perrin announced his arrival, and produced to Mr. Wyllie a copy of his powers, from the President of the French Republic. By these powers he was named Commissioner of the Republic, with full power to negotiate such arrangements, as shall arrest in its source every cause of ulterior difficulties, and to execute such an arrangement, without further necessity of ratification.

Resulting from the above, conferences commenced on the 10th of January, and were protracted till the 25th of March, when the Declaration, published on the 25th, in the *Polynesian*, announced that rock of the points at issue, between this Government and that of France, had been arranged and signed, as provided by the 12th Article of the Rules of Conference.

This disposed of the questions of a faithful adoption of the Treaty of 26th March, 1846;—the question of duty on Spirits, by its submission to the Legislature, for their action upon it;—the question of the perfect equality between Catholics and Protestants, by its reference to the Legislature;—and the question of language, by receiving, in French, all documents which are received in English, but to be accompanied with an English translation, certified to be true, in cases where the employes, whose duty it is to make use of them, do not understand French.

The remaining points, presented by M. Perrin in his demands on the 1st Feb. are,—

5. The withdrawal of the exception imposed upon French whalers, importing wines and spirits, and the abrogation of the regulation which obliges ships laden with figures to pay, and support the Customs house guard, put on board to watch over their shipment or discharge.

6. The reimbursement of all the duties received in virtue of the disposition, the withdrawal of which is demanded by the paragraph above mentioned; or a proportional indemnity given for the damage occasioned to French commerce by the restriction which has suspended its relation.

9. The removal of the Governor, who caused, or allowed to be violated on Hawaii, the domicile of the Abbe Marchal, or the order to that Governor to make reparation to that Missionary, the one or the other decision, to be inserted in the Official Journal.

10. The payment to a French citizen, proprietor of the Hotel of France of the damages committed in his house by foreign sailors, against whom the Hawaiian Government took no process.

To the above six demands, the King's government replied, through Mr. Wyllie, on the 15th of March as follows:—

5. The King's Government would gladly withdraw any exception to French whalers if any such existed, but it has been already shown that no such exception ever existed. French whalers are entirely upon the same footing, in all respects as the whalers of any other foreign nation. France cannot claim more, in accordance with the treaty of 26th March 1846, and the King cannot grant more to France, in conformity with His Treaties with other powers. The same remark applies to the Custom house regulations respecting the payment of a Guard on board, deposit, transit, and transshipment of spirits.

6. No reimbursement or indemnity can be given, where no wrong has been done. To admit the contrary would imply a violation of the Treaty, which the King's Government are justified by all current opinion, and by the clear and natural wording of the Treaty, in denying. France cannot insist that this government should affix upon itself a stain which in its own opinion and that of the world it does not deserve.

7. The King's Government would annihilate their right to claim of foreign ships the observance of their Port Regulations, if they were to admit the first Minister of Public Instruction, or to allow \$60 for a delay in Port, for which the Captain alone was to blame. All that was shown clearly to M. Dillon, in Mr. Wyllie's despatch No. 53, of 25th November 1848, published at page 41 of the published correspondence with that gentleman. The King's Government always considered, and consider still, that they deserve thanks for having reduced the fine, legally incurred by the General Teste, from \$500 to \$25. The law which the Capt. of the General Teste had violated, is quoted at page 44 of our correspondence.

8. All that M. Dillon asked for on the 16th April 1849, with reference to the complaint of the Abbe Coulon, was to be informed what measures would be taken to prevent such acts as he had complained of. That was all that the Rev. Abbe, who with a moderation worthy of his clerical character, had declined appearing before the native Judge, had required him to do. Mr. Wyllie courteously received M. Dillon's despatch, and referred the complaint to the King's Minister of Public Instruction, as will be seen by referring to Mr. Wyllie's note No. 34, of 19th April 1849, page 317 of the same correspondence, and that Minister after explaining the case, replied as will be seen at page 360, that should like cases occur in future, on being duly informed it will be his duty to give notice to the proper officer, that he might proceed against the offenders according to law. It is understood the native Judge before whom the boys were carried, dismissed the case, on the ground of want of proof. If the Rev. Abbe had made his complaint, either directly or through his Bishop, (which would have been preferable) on proof of their delinquency, the boys would have been punished severely, under the law, section VI, chapter VI, part IV, second Act of Kamehameha III, and if the Judge had neglected his duty, he would have been liable to the punishment provided for in the law of 31st May 1841, page 89 of the old laws. The King's Government do not encourage sacrilege of any kind; the law amply provides for its punishment, and if the Bishop will instruct his Clergy in all such cases to prefer a written complaint to the Minister of Public Instruction, it will be his duty to see the law rigidly enforced against proved delinquents. It is not believed that the offense complained of has since been repeated any where on the islands.

9. The facts, stated by his Excellency the Governor of Hawaii, published at page 59 of the official correspondence with Admiral de Tromelin, make it appear that the Abbe Marchal, either screened or caused to be screened, in his double a function from justice. By referring to Mr. Wyllie's despatch of the 24th August 1849, published at page 67, of the same correspondence, it will be seen that the King's Government had no intelligence of such a complaint, till it had been magnified, very irregularly, with a formal inter-national demand. It will not be contended that on the mere complaint of a Catholic Priest to a French Consul, (in itself a contempt of the magistracy of the country) there should be a just cause why the Governor of the largest island of the kingdom should be dismissed without a hearing. That would indeed be a strange doctrine under the laws of nations, and a singular interpretation of the 2d article of the Treaty of the 26th March, 1846. Process at law against the Governor before the King's chief Justice, was offered to M. Dillon, and even a free passage to Hawaii in the King's Yacht, that he might witness the fairness of the proceedings. M. Dillon did not accept the offer, but the courts of the country are open to the Rev. Abbe, should he wish to prosecute.

10. The receipt of Victor Chancelier for \$93 50 cents is in the archives of the Foreign office. It rests upon the authority of British officers that Victor's original bill for damages was only for \$8 (see page 53 of the same correspondence), so that the claim of Chancelier, was paid more than ten times over, on the 30th of August 1849, a fact with many others, which General Labitte could not possibly have known when he placed the ten demands of France in the hands of M. Perrin.

The King's government invite the government of France to adopt the same treaty, *mutatis mutandis* as that lately formed with the United States; or to consider the present treaty at an end in twelve months from this date, and in the meanwhile to form a new treaty free from the objections and ambiguities of the old.

The King's government consider that France is specially bound to remove all the restrictions imposed on the King in the 3d and 6th articles of the treaty of 26th March, 1846, both because he was deprived of his rightful prerogatives of Sovereignty by a French officer, under a threat of instant war, and because the Government consented to the reduction of the duties on wines, on the condition of the removal of those restrictions to which M. Dillon repeatedly pledged himself with emphatic promises of his best endeavors.

The King's government desire a mutual accord between France, Great Britain and the United States, so as to render their Treaties uniform on these islands, to provide for a settlement of all disputes arising under them by amicable reference, to respect the king's neutrality in all wars one with another, and to adopt one common rule, in regard to the duties and conduct of their political agents, toward the King's Administration, so as to relieve it from an oppressive and vexatious interference, depriving the King's officers of all time to attend to the internal interests of the country. If things are to continue, as they have been, the Government of the country as an independent state, is an impracticability.

R. C. WYLLIE.
Foreign Office, 15th March, 1851.

Since the publication of the Declaration, nothing further has been accomplished towards a settlement of the remaining points, upon which M. Perrin has asked instructions from his government.

On the 26th ult., M. Perrin embarked for France, and will return again in the course of a twelve month, empowered, as we trust, to settle the remaining difficulties in a manner satisfactory to both governments, and consistently with the independence of his Hawaiian Majesty, Kamehameha III.

HAWAIIAN PARLIAMENT.

The House of Nobles met on Tuesday, but adjourned to Monday next, in consequence of the demise of Kekauonohi, a chief woman of the highest rank in the Islands. No business was transacted, on this account.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

May 28.—Ukeke presented a petition from the Native Constables of Honolulu, for an increase of pay. Referred.

Mr. Parsons, from the Committee on Finance, reported a Bill to close the Ports of Kealahou, Kawaihine and Waimea, and to provide for the granting of Permits to Foreign Vessels to visit such Ports as are not Ports of Entry.

Mr. Robertson moved that the Bill be laid on the Table. Mr. Parsons opposed the motion, and, after discussion, the house divided; when the following members voted for the motion:—Messrs. Lee, Rhodes, Robertson, Funk, Kalkoon, Kapehe, Wahineikaiki, Kaahalamu, Ukeke, Kekaulahou, and Barenaba; and the following members against it, viz.:—Messrs. Parsons, Kook, Gulick, Knap, Kanuawai, Kanakau, Kanohai, Lilikalani, Richardson, Ua, Lokomakai, and Kahookui. The motion being lost by majority of one. The principal reason advanced by the supporters of the Bill, was, that the keeping open of those Ports of Entry would be very expensive for the Government; requiring, according to an Estimate made by the Minister of Finance, an appropriation of about \$16,000 this year, for the purpose of building Customs Houses, and paying Collectors, Police Justices, &c.; contending, also, that the keeping open of those of no real benefit to the people, while it tends to promote smuggling, and other disorders throughout the Islands. The opposers of the Bill denied the correctness of the above estimate of expense, contending that there was no appropriation needed, at the ports in question, for the building of Customs Houses, Stores, or extra salaries to officers; also, that no complaints against those ports had been presented to the House, nor a single petition to close them, from any part of the Kingdom. They also objected to the Bill, on the ground that it would leave the Islands of Hawaii and Kauai almost entirely destitute of the protection from smuggling, now afforded by Collectors and Customs House Officers; also that the Bill extends a privilege to foreign vessels, calculated to injure severely the coasting trade, which should properly belong to Hawaiian vessels only; and that those persons who had invested capital in the building of houses, in the purchase of vessels, and agriculture, supposing that those ports would remain open, would be heavy losers by the passing of this Bill.

On motion of Mr. Parsons, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole, with Kanakau in the Chair, to consider the Bill. The 1st Section having been read, and a motion made to adopt it, Mr. Lee opposed it in a speech of considerable length. The debate was continued without a division, until a quarter to three o'clock, when the house adjourned.

May 29.—Mr. Parsons presented a petition from Lahaina, signed by upwards of 1100 persons, against the passage of any law to allow the sale of Spirituous Liquors in Lahaina. Referred.

Mr. Richardson, from the Committee on Judiciary, reported a Bill to abolish the use of Stamps, in numerous cases, where they are now required by law.

The report was adopted and the bill committed. A message was read from the House of Nobles, stating that they had rejected the coral reef bill.

On motion of Mr. Parsons, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill to close certain ports of entry postponed from yesterday. After a lengthy debate a motion to adjourn was lost by a majority of two, and the discussion was continued until 2 o'clock, when a motion to adjourn was carried.

May 30.—After disposing of some petitions, the House, on motion of Mr. Parsons, resumed the consideration of the Bill to close certain Ports of Entry, in Committee of the whole, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Mr. Richardson moved that the further consideration of the subject of closing the Ports in question, in section first, be postponed indefinitely. After discussion, the motion was carried by a majority of eight. On motion of Mr. Lee a Select Committee was appointed to embody the remaining sections of the Bill providing for the granting of permits to foreign vessels to go to bye ports, into a distinct Bill, the measure originally contemplated by the House.

Dr. Rooke presented a Bill to lay a tax on land for the support of the Police and other improvements. Read a first time and made the order of the day for Tuesday.

The Post Office Bill was read a third time and passed. The Bill to Equalize the Tonnage Dues on Merchant Vessels, at the several ports, was read a third time and passed.

May 31.—After disposing of some unimportant petitions, Mr. Parsons requested that the time be extended for the Committee on Finance to report in regard to spirit duties. Granted.

Mr. Richardson, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a Bill for the abolition of names in certain cases. Read a first and second time, and ordered to be engrossed.

Mr. Funk, from the Committee of Conference made a report in regard to the Lieutenant Governor's Bill. On motion of Kanakau, the report was received and the Bill laid on the table.

Dr. Rooke, from the Select Committee, reported a Bill to provide for the granting of permits to foreign vessels, to visit bye ports. Read a first time and made the order of the day for Tuesday.

On motion of Dr. Rooke, a Select Committee was appointed to take into consideration the subject of strays.

Mr. Gulick moved for a re-consideration of the vote of yesterday, postponing indefinitely the further consideration of the first section of the Bill for closing certain ports of entry. After debate, the motion was carried, 15 to 9. The discussion on the Bill being again resumed, Mr. Gulick moved that Kawaihine be struck out of the Bill, so as to leave that port open.

Mr. Robertson moved as an amendment, that Kawaihine and Waimea be both struck out. The amendment was warmly supported by Mr. Rhodes and other Kauai members. On dividing, the amendment was lost by a majority of four.

Mr. Gulick's motion was carried unanimously, leaving Kawaihine open. The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and made the order of the day for Tuesday.

Journal till to-morrow, as a mark of respect for the deceased chiefs, M. Kekauonohi.

June 4. No business. House adjourned till Saturday, being informed that the House of Nobles had adjourned till then on account of the death of Kekauonohi.

PROCEEDINGS

of the Meeting held at Mauna Kiki, Wednesday Evening, May 4.

The Legislative Committee on Education having given notice in the *Polynesian* of May 31, of a desire to meet the Foreign Residents of Honolulu, to submit certain questions to them in regard to the education of their children, a very respectable number met at Mauna Kiki on Wednesday evening.

On motion of P. J. Gulick, M. P., Chairman of the Committee on Education, S. Reynolds Esq., was called to the Chair, and W. Goodale was appointed Secretary.

The Chairman, after remarking upon the importance of Education, the first efforts to promote it among the children of foreigners, and the good effected by the Oahu Charity School, stated that the object of the meeting, was to deliberate with the Committee on Education as to what could be done and what provisions could be made for the education of the children in the foreign community of the islands. The question would arise, "is this community willing to be taxed for this purpose, being allowed to control the funds so raised?"

C. C. Harris followed in some general remarks. G. M. Robertson M. P., in behalf of the Committee on Education, read an act which it is proposed to submit to Parliament. This gave rise to a discussion in which Messrs. Lee, Robertson, Gulick, McKee, Harris, Armstrong and Taylor participated.

On motion of the Hon. W. L. Lee, Resolved, That this meeting approve of the object of the act proposed, and recommend its adoption by the legislature.

C. C. Harris Esq., presented the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted: Resolved, 1. That by the education of all classes in the community, public tranquility and prosperity are most effectually secured—that the education of youth is the most effectual way of preventing crime and poverty in man.

2. That we recognise the necessity of supporting the school master for the instruction of children, or of maintaining forces for the subjection, and prisons for the punishment of men.

3. That it is as much the duty of the public to provide education for those unable to provide themselves, as to supply bread to the needy.

4. That the most intelligent is the most productive labor, and that the productiveness of the individual is not only a benefit to himself but to the community.

5. That as the intelligent man needs not to be told when or where to go to work, that if we provide national schools for the youth it is probable that we shall be called on to provide national workshops, or national works for a needy population.

6. That we regard with satisfaction every effort to promote the cause of education in these islands.

7. That we commend this subject to the consideration of the Legislature, and of our fellow foreign residents, and most earnestly invite discussion upon the matter.

On motion of Rev. R. Armstrong, it was voted that the proceedings of the meeting be published in the *Polynesian*.

The interest of those present in the subjects discussed continued till adjournment, which took place at a late hour.

S. REYNOLDS, Chairman.

W. GOODALE, Secretary.

PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE.—From a long and wellreasoned article in "Le Journal Des Debats," by Michel Chevalier, we extract the following paragraph, which is instructive in many particulars, and will afford material for serious reflection to the friends of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The tribute of commendation bestowed upon the legislation of these islands is all the more grateful, coming from a source where prejudice or bias in our favor cannot, for a moment, be supposed to exist; but where facts alone have had an influence in thus eliciting praise.

"The example of England was calculated to cause every body to reflect. The interests which benefited there by Protection were vast and powerful; those of the landed proprietors, the owners of sugar estates, the shipping interest, the copper mines, the silk manufacture, and many others. For persons in these classes the profit was considerable. For agriculture especially, it appeared to be a question of existence or non-existence. If, therefore, England abandoned the Protective system, the system must have had great disadvantages, it must have been acknowledged to be irreconcilable with public liberty, with the right which all classes have to be equally considered by law, with national prosperity, and above all, with the well being of the greater number.

In consequence, by nearly every people, the Custom-house code has been submitted to a rigorous examination. Every where its severity has been mitigated, and it has been rendered more liberal. This has been put in practice in turn, by the United States, by Holland, Belgium, Spain, Russia, Piedmont, and Austria. Only France has done nothing. In 1847 the Government brought forward a very commendable proposal for a law; it was buried in the committee, and France remains with the most prohibitory tariff of the four quarters of the world. The Bey of Tripoli, and the half savage chief who governs the Sandwich Islands, with regard to commercial transactions, are infinitely more liberal than the French people, who plique themselves on giving to the world a model for all kinds of liberty."

DISTURBANCE AT HANAIE.—On the 24th ult. a disturbance took place at Hanaie, Kauai, in which a native lawyer by the name of Nuuanu was shot with a pistol, but not seriously injured, by Mr. Wundenberg.

The occasion of this riot was, that a party of the natives, considering the decision of one of the magistrates unjust, they undertook to depose him themselves, without the intervention of the Governor, whose duty it was to act in such cases. Wundenberg, who was acting as sheriff, was called in by the magistrate to assist in dispersing the people, and drew a pistol. He was immediately seized around the waist by Nuuanu, when he turned his hand down and fired at N. The ball grazed his back, merely raising a blister. The people immediately disarmed him, tore his clothes off, bruised him and carried him off to prison, but soon released him. No further violence was inflicted. The case is to undergo an investigation.

LETTERS FROM AN ABSENTEE.

No. 2.—Continued.

At the distance of five miles from Benicia, the embryo city of Vallejo, and Capital of the State of California. At the late session of the Legislature of the State, the subject was much discussed, respecting the location of the capital of the State. Various localities were examined, but General Vallejo made such munificent propositions for the erection of public buildings, and the promotion of the interests of education and humanity, that the Legislature finally decided to locate the Capital at a beautiful site upon Napa river. The sum pledged by the General amounted to near \$400,000; besides a large appropriation of land. Among the propositions, were such as the following:

For building State Capital,	\$125,000
" " Governor's House,	10,000
" " Orphan Asylum,	20,000
" " Asylum for the Blind,	20,000
" " State University,	20,000
" " Lunatic Asylum,	20,000

Smaller appropriations are to be devoted to minor institutions. Whether the scheme projected upon such a scale of more than princely munificence, will ever be realized is thought by many to be somewhat doubtful, still arrangements are now in progress, for the speedy erection of public buildings for the approaching session of the Legislature. Should the General and those associated with him fulfil their engagements, it will show that cities are built in California in a different manner from any part of the world. At the time of our visit to Vallejo, only one framed building and a few tents were to be seen within the area of many miles. It remains to be seen what the result will be of this truly stupendous enterprise. I have become so much interested in its success, that I have endeavored to inform myself, as much as possible, respecting the gentleman whose name is so closely identified with the future Capital of California. I refer to General Don Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo. He is a native of California, born in Monterey, 1817, and was an officer of considerable distinction under the Republic of Mexico. His father was a military officer before him, holding a commission under the crown of Spain, and lived to the advanced age of 85 years. When the General saw that the American flag would wave where that of Mexico had hitherto been hoisted, he improved the opportunity for doing all in his power to advance the prosperity and welfare of the country under its new government. After the war between the U. S. and Mexico closed, he evinced his patriotism in the convention that framed a constitution for the new State of California. He is a very large landed proprietor, owning an estate or estates many leagues in extent, and for these he is believed to hold the best of Mexican titles, which will undoubtedly be recognized as valid by the U. S. government. He has lately disposed of an estate, to an American, for the sum of \$50,000. This gentleman has already made arrangements for carrying forward agricultural operations upon an extensive scale. A vessel is now on her passage from an Atlantic city, with a cargo of agricultural implements, and I am informed that arrangements have been made for the importation of a large number of Chinese, to be employed as laborers. So rushes onward the immense tide of enterprise, in building cities, in projecting agricultural plans, and in advancing the State of California. It is not theory alone, but reality which characterises the aspect of affairs in this quarter of the globe.

In closing I will just allude to a series of letters appearing in the "Alta California" written at Honolulu by a gentleman signing himself "Peregrine." His name is H. Carlton, Esq., late editor of the California Illustrated News. While his observations at Honolulu evince considerable discernment, still he cannot plead innocent to the charge of jotting down some remarks that certainly will not be credited except by those who are particularly desirous of believing what is not true. On the 6th of March, he remarks, "with regard to the introduction of christianity, too much praise can hardly be bestowed on their [the missionaries] efforts," but on the 10th of the same month, he says by no means inclined to bestow praise. "The missionaries appear in Mr. Carlton's estimation to have been most grievously in fault, and most sadly mistaken, in preaching up a rigid observance of the Sabbath. 'From a feast they have transmuted it [the Sabbath] into a fast.' As an instance 'in corroboration of this overstrained rigidity,' he refers to the case of the schooner Loo Choo, at Lahaina. Most certainly Mr. C. could not have read certain documents published in the *Polynesian*, a few days subsequent to that event. His representation of that transaction is, I am quite confident, far from being in accordance with the truth. But it is by no means my intention to write a review of Peregrine's correspondence, I cannot, however, refrain from remarking that it does seem a great pity that the various classes of persons who find so much fault with the manner that the modern Protestant missions are conducted, do not start missions among the heathen on their own principles.

Let the authors of Typee, Los Gringos, and the Peregrine letters, commence a mission in some of the unevangelized islands of Polynesia, and we should watch its progress with intense interest.

D.

OUR COUNTRY.—If an angel could descend from Heaven to declare under which government of our world the people enjoyed the most freedom and should be the most contented and happy, he would unhesitatingly pronounce in favor of that of the United States, for under it man possesses all that is valuable or desirable; all that can excite grateful feelings and promote human happiness. What is there that an American citizen can desire that he does not possess? We cannot imagine a single deficiency in his civil or religious rights and privileges, nor does the Government offer the slightest obstacle to his pursuit of happiness. The road of preferment is open alike to all, and those who fail to reach distinction must attribute their want of success to their lack of energy and perseverance, and not to the institutions under which they live. We doubt whether human ingenuity could devise a system of government more replete with all the elements of human progress and happiness than that of the United States.—Am. paper.

THE UNION CLUB.—Some large ship owners of New